

REPORT OF THE AUDIT DEPARTMENT THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2003-3-E

DUKE POWER COMPANY

REPORT OF THE AUDIT DEPARTMENT THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2003-3-E

DUKE POWER COMPANY

INDEX

| | <u>.</u> | PAGE NUMBER |
|------------|--|----------------|
| Analysis | *************************************** | 1 - 9 |
| Exhibit A: | Coal Cost Statistics | 10 |
| Exhibit B: | Received Coal - Cost Per Ton Comparison | 11 |
| Exhibit C: | Detail of Nuclear Cost | 12 |
| Exhibit D: | Total Burned Cost (Fossil and Nuclear) | 13 |
| Exhibit E: | Cost of Fuel | 14 |
| Exhibit F: | Factor Computation | 15 |
| Exhibit G: | SC Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues and Expenses | 16-19 |

REPORT OF THE AUDIT DEPARTMENT

DOCKET NO. 2003-3-E

DUKE POWER COMPANY

ANALYSIS

The Audit Department Staff has made a study of the books and records of Duke Power Company, Charlotte, North Carolina, relative to the Commission's requirement under Docket No. 2003-3-E, that periodic hearings be conducted before the Commission concerning the Adjustment of Base Rates for Fuel Costs.

CURRENT REVIEW PERIOD

The current investigation of Duke Power Company's Retail Fuel Adjustment Clause covers the period June 2002 through May 2003. Since the fuel hearing is scheduled for May 2003, Staff's audit covered through the month of March 2003, with the months of April and May 2003 estimated. In the last fuel hearing, fuel figures for April and May 2002 were estimated, therefore, Staff reviewed Duke's books and records for the period April 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003. The under-recovery amount for April 2003 and the under-recovery amount for May 2003 were estimated for the purpose of adjusting base rates effective June 1, 2003. The April and May 2003 estimates will be trued-up at Duke's next hearing after the costs are examined.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The Commission's Audit Department's examination consisted of the following:

Analysis of Fuel Stock - Account # 151

- 2. Sample of Receipts to the Fuel Stock Account -- Account #151
- 3. Verification of Charges to Nuclear Fuel Expense Account # 518
- 4. Analysis of Purchased Power and Interchange (Net)
- 5. Verification of KWH Sales
- 6. Comparison of Coal Costs
- 7. An Analysis of Spot Coal Purchasing Procedures
- 8. Recomputation of Fuel Costs and Verification of Deferred Fuel Costs
- 9. Recomputation of True-up for (Over) Under-Recovered Fuel Costs

ANALYSIS OF FUEL STOCK ACCOUNT - ACCOUNT # 151

Staff's analysis of the Fuel Stock Account consisted of tracing receipts to and from the General Ledger (debits and credits), reviewing monthly fuel charges originating in fuel accounting and insuring that only proper charges are entered in the Company's computation of fuel costs for purposes of adjusting base rates for fuel costs.

SAMPLE OF RECEIPTS TO THE FUEL STOCK ACCOUNT-- ACCOUNT #151

Staff's sample of receipts to the Fuel Stock Account consisted of randomly selecting transactions, tracing each of these transactions to a waybill and a purchase order for documentation purposes, and recalculating the transactions to insure mathematical correctness.

VERIFICATION OF NUCLEAR FUEL EXPENSE - ACCOUNT # 518

The Staff traced the expense amounts to the General Ledger. The expenses were also traced to filings to the Commission from the Company.

ANALYSIS OF PURCHASED AND INTERCHANGE POWER (NET)

Staff performed an examination of the Company's purchased power and interchange

(Net) amount used in the Fuel Adjustment Clause.

Staff obtained the details of purchases and sales made by Duke from and to other electric utilities. Staff verified all individual transactions of purchased and interchanged power to source documents. Staff verified amounts that are being used in computing total fuel costs for each month. These details allowed the Staff to identify fuel costs that were being passed through the clause in computing the factor above or below the base for each period.

VERIFICATION OF KWH SALES

The Audit Department Staff reconciled the KWH sales as reported to the Commission through monthly fuel adjustment filings to the Company's monthly Financial and Operating Reports.

COMPARISON OF COAL COSTS

Staff prepared exhibits from Duke's books and records reflecting coal costs during the review period. Specifically, these exhibits are as follows:

Exhibit A - Coal Cost Statistics

Exhibit B - Received Coal-Cost Per Ton Comparison

With reference to Exhibit A, Coal Cost Statistics, Staff has shown a detailed analysis of spot and contract coal for the twelve (12) - month period April 2002 through March 2003. The detail gives emphasis to tons purchased, percentage of tons purchased, cost per ton delivered, total delivered cost, and cost per MBTU.

In Exhibit B, Received Coal-Cost Per Ton Comparison, Staff reflects the overall cost per ton of coal by month for the three major electric utilities regulated by this Commission.

ANALYSIS OF SPOT COAL PURCHASING PROCEDURES

The Audit Staff examined the procedure followed by the Company's Fuel Purchasing Department for obtaining and accepting offers on spot coal. To achieve this, Staff chose two months of the audit period that had received large amounts of spot coal. Staff examined spot coal proposals received in the months of December 2002 and January 2003.

The Fuel Purchasing Department maintains a list of coal vendors from whom proposals are received monthly. These coal vendors send their proposals to Duke via Spot Coal Sales Proposal Data Sheets, with each proposal or offer on a separate sheet.

If the Company decides to purchase spot coal in a given month, then the proposals are evaluated. For evaluation purposes, the spot coal sales proposals are compiled on an Evaluation of Spot Bids computer run and are ranked by the cost per MBTU. The purchasing agents consider at least three factors when they agree to the spot coal offers: (a) the price per ton (including freight), (b) the BTU, ash, and sulfur content of the coal offered, and (c) the past experience with the supplier and the coal obtained from the producer. The Company's purchasing agents determine the current market price for spot coal prior to negotiating with the coal vendors. In this way, the agents determine the limits they should stay within when bargaining for coal. The agents bargain over the price of the coal, and either accept (the original offer or a counter offer) or reject the coal vendor's offer.

Upon acceptance of an offer, the Fuel Purchasing Department prepares a purchase order, a copy of which is mailed to the coal vendor. When the coal is received at the plant, the Company analyzes the coal for BTU, ash, and sulfur content and prepares a coal analysis report which is sent to the Fuel Purchasing Department. The Fuel Purchasing Department determines

the appropriate premium or penalty on the coal, and the results are forwarded to the Company's Accounting Section, which in turn, adds a premium or assesses a penalty to the total amount due to the coal vendor.

The Fuel Purchasing Department closely monitors the quality of coal shipped by the various producers. If a certain producer renders poor performance, the purchasing agent records it and considers this when analyzing any future offers from the supplier.

As mentioned previously, Staff examined spot coal offers received for the months of December 2002 and January 2003. Staff obtained the Company's Evaluation of Spot Bids computer runs for the aforementioned months. The Evaluation of Spot Bids run is listed alphabetically by plant, with each plant's spot coal offers ranked by cost per MBTU. Also included on the Evaluation of Spot Bids run is the name of the coal company, the name of the producer, number of tons offered, coal specifications, the number of tons purchased, the plant to which the coal was shipped, or a reason for rejecting the offer.

During December 2002, 20 offers were submitted (per offer sheets) and Duke accepted 21 orders (several plant orders per offer sheet). During January 2003, 29 offers were submitted (per offer sheets) and Duke accepted 10 orders.

RECOMPUTATION OF TRUE-UP FOR (OVER) UNDER-RECOVERED FUEL COSTS

Staff analyzed the cumulative under-recovery of fuel costs that the Company had incurred for the period April 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003 totaling \$1,166,680. Staff added the projected under-recovery of \$871,022 for the month of April 2003 and the projected under-recovery of \$5,494,525 for May 2003 to arrive at a cumulative under-recovery of \$7,532,227. The Company's cumulative under-recovery as of March 2003 and cumulative

under-recovery as of May 2003 differs from Staff's. Staff's Purchased Power figures for most of the review period differ from the Company's figures. The Company's and the Staff's Purchased Power figures are the same for November and December 2002, when compared on a rounded basis. Staff's figures, per Staff's report, reflect calculation adjustments made to Purchased Power Costs for the aforementioned months, based on Staff's review of Purchased Power system operations reports and invoices. Staff's Exhibit G, S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues and Expenses, which consist of four pages, provides details of Staff's cumulative under-recovery balance.

As stated in Duke Power Company's Adjustment for Fuel Costs, fuel costs will be included in base rates to the extent determined reasonable and proper by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission should consider the under-recovery of \$7,532,227 along with the anticipated fuel costs for the period June 1, 2003 to May 31, 2004, for the purpose of determining the base cost of fuel in rates effective June 1, 2003.

This under-recovery figure of \$7,532,227 was provided to the Commission's Utilities Department.

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION

Based on the Audit Staff's examination of Duke Power Company's books and records, and the utilization of the fuel cost-recovery mechanism as directed by this Commission, the Audit Staff is of the opinion that the Company has complied with the directives (per the Fuel Adjustment Clause) of the Commission.

EXHIBITS

Exhibits relative to this report are identified as follows:

EXHIBIT A: COAL COST STATISTICS

In Exhibit A, Coal Cost Statistics, Staff compares spot, contract and total coal received for the months of April 2002 through March 2003. The comparison is made in the following areas:

- 1. Tons Purchased
- 2. Percentage of Total Tons Purchased
- 3. Received Cost Per Ton
- 4. Total Received Cost
- 5. Cost Per MBTU

EXHIBIT B: RECEIVED COAL-COST PER TON COMPARISON

In Exhibit B, Staff has shown for comparison purposes, the freight cost per ton, mine cost per ton, the total cost per ton, and the cost per MBTU of received coal for Duke Power Company, Carolina Power & Light Company, and South Carolina Electric & Gas Company. The costs per ton shown for the period April 2002 through March 2003 included both spot and contract purchases, and were extracted from required filings for Carolina Power & Light Company, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, and from Duke Power Company.

EXHIBIT C: DETAIL OF NUCLEAR COST

In Exhibit C, Staff has shown in detail, the two components in total nuclear costs. These components are as follows:

1. Burn-up Cost

2. Disposal Cost

EXHIBIT D: TOTAL BURNED COST (FOSSIL AND NUCLEAR)

This exhibit reflects the dollar amounts of burned costs, including emission allowance expenses, and the percentage of the Total Burned Costs for fossil and nuclear fuel by months from April 2002 through March 2003.

EXHIBIT E: COST OF FUEL

In Exhibit E, Staff has computed the total fuel cost applicable to the factor computation.

There are three (3) components used in arriving at this cost. Those components are as follows:

- 1. Cost of Fuel Burned...This amount is the burned cost of all fossil and nuclear fuel during the period. A detailed breakdown between coal (including emission allowance expenses), oil, gas and nuclear fuel can be seen in Exhibit D.
- 2. Purchase and Interchange Power Fuel Cost... This amount is the monthly KWH's delivered to or received by one electric utility system (and/or power marketer) from another.
- 3. Fuel Cost Recovered through Intersystem Sales... This amount is the fuel-related cost on KWH's sold during the period to other electric utilities and /or power marketers.

Total fuel cost applicable to the factor is computed by adding the cost of fuel burned to purchased power and interchange power fuel cost. This amount is then reduced by fuel associated with intersystem sales.

EXHIBIT F: FACTOR COMPUTATION

Staff has computed the Fuel Cost Adjustment Factor by month beginning with April 2002

and going through March 2003. In computing this factor, total fuel cost applicable to the Fuel Adjustment Clause is divided by total system sales, excluding intersystem sales. This results in fuel cost per KWH. The fuel cost per KWH is then compared to the base cost per KWH as ordered by the Commission. This variance is reflected as the monthly fuel cost adjustment factor.

EXHIBIT G: S.C. RETAIL COMPARISON OF FUEL REVENUES AND EXPENSES

Shown in this exhibit is the computation of the cumulative under-recovery at May 31, 2003.

DUKE POWER COMPANY COAL COST STATISTICS APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| | | SPOT | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| MONTH | TONS RECEIVED | PERCENTAGE | COST/TON RECEIVED | TOTAL RECEIVED COST | \$/MBTU |
| | TONS | % | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 92,029.85 | 7.72% | 59.69 | 5,493,241.21 | 2.1552 |
| May-02 | 116,413.65 | 9.40% | 44.23 | 5,148,621.54 | 1.7627 |
| Jun-02 | 120,638.20 | 9.45% | 46.47 | 5,606,533.36 | 1.8068 |
| Jui-02 | 104,181.55 | 9.82% | 44.15 | 4,599,861.48 | 1.7918 |
| Aug-02 | 249,858.00 | 17.35% | 42.80 | 10,693,519.64 | 1.6924 |
| Sep-02 | 100,627.60 | 9.28% | 40.74 | 4,099,484.15 | 1.6861 |
| Oct-02 | 220,357.15 | 16.78% | 43.62 | 9,611,723.28 | 1.7516 |
| Nov-02 | 261,267.50 | 20.23% | 35.43 | 9,256,598.94 | 1.4632 |
| Dec-02 | 342,146.55 | 27.15% | 38.33 | 13,115,949.99 | 1.5536 |
| Jan-03 | 357,567.60 | 23.63% | 48.54 | 17,357,512.34 | 1.9374 |
| Feb-03 | 213,012.60 | 16.08% | 43.52 | 9,270,954.10 | 1.7601 |
| Mar-03 | 385,546.80 | 22.58% | 43.22 | 16,693,761.56 | 1.7477 |
| Totals (4/02- 3/03) | 2,563,647.05 | = | | 110,947,761.59 | |
| . | | CONTRA | СТ | | |
| | | | COST/TON | TOTAL RECEIVED | |
| <u>MONTH</u> | TONS RECEIVED | PERCENTAGE | RECEIVED | <u>COST</u> | <u>\$/MBTU</u> |
| | TONS | % | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 1,100,109.50 | 92.28% | 40.56 | 44,617,305.23 | 1.4427 |
| May-02 | 1,121,676.65 | 90.60% | 40.85 | 45,823,491.40 | 1.6763 |
| Jun-02 | 1,155,994.06 | 90.55% | 41.01 | 47,406,930.15 | 1.6670 |
| Jul-02 | 956,778.90 | 90.18% | 40.99 | 39,222,604.29 | 1.6660 |
| Aug-02 | 1,190,521.50 | 82.65% | 41.38 | 49,261,051.90 | 1.6597 |
| Sep-02 | 983,315.45 | 90.72% | 40.44 | 39,768,411.73 | 1.6336 |
| Oct-02 | 1,092,961.75 | 83.22% | 41.39 | 45,235,216.47 | 1.6791 |
| Nov-02 | 1,030,411.45 | 79.77% | 40.05 | 41,264,200.72 | 1.6360 |
| Dec-02 | 917,923.60 | 72.85% | 40.00 | 36,719,458.16 | 1.6408 |
| Jan-03 | 1,155,439.90 | 76.37% | 40.45 | 46,740,915.56 | 1.6444 |
| Feb-03 | 1,111,378.80 | 83.92% | 30.79 | 34,218,564.42 | 1.2638 |
| Mar-03 | 1,322,102.65 | 77.42% | 41.25 | 54,534,381.17 | 1.6792 |
| Totals (4/02- 3/03) | 13,138,614.21 | = | | 524,812,531.20 | |
| | | COMBINE | | | |
| <u>MONTH</u> | TONS RECEIVED | PERCENTAGE | COST/TON RECEIVED | TOTAL RECEIVED <u>COST</u> | \$/MBTU |
| | TONS | % | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 1,192,139.35 | 100.00% | 42.04 | 50,110,546.44 | 1.7119 |
| May-02 | 1,238,090.30 | 100.00% | 41.17 | 50,972,112.94 | 1.6856 |
| Jun-02 | 1,276,632.26 | 100.00% | 41.52 | 53,013,463.51 | 1.6837 |
| Jul-02 | 1,060,960.45 | 100.00% | 41.31 | 43,822,465.77 | 1.6784 |
| Aug-02 | 1,440,379.50 | 100.00% | 41.62 | 59,954,571.54 | 1.6653 |
| Sep-02 | 1,083,943.05 | 100.00% | 40.47 | 43,867,895.88 | 1.6349 |
| Oct-02 | 1,313,318.90 | 100.00% | 41.77 | 54,846,939.75 | 1.6915 |
| Nov-02 | 1,291,678.95 | 100.00% | 39.11 | 50,520,799.66 | 1.5977 |
| Dec-02 | 1,260,070.15 | 100.00% | 39.55 | 49,835,408.15 | 1.6169 |
| Jan-03 | 1,513,007.50 | 100.00% | 42.36 | 64,098,427.90 | 1.7141 |
| Feb-03 | 1,324,391.40 | 100.00% | 32.84 | 43,489,518.52 | 1.3458 |
| Mar-03 | 1,707,649.45 | 100.00% | 41.71 | 71,228,142.73 | 1.6955 |
| Totals (4/02- 3/03) | 15,702,261.26 | = 40 | | 635,760,292.79 | |
| | | -10- | | | |

DUKE POWER COMPANY RECEIVED COAL-COST PER TON COMPARISON APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| DUKE | POWER CO | MPANY |
|------|----------|-------|
| ·= | EDEICHT | TOTAL |

| | <u>INVOICE</u> | <u>FREIGHT</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER |
| <u>MONTH</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>MBTU</u> |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 26.95 | 15.09 | 42.04 | 1.7119 |
| May-02 | 26.01 | 15.16 | 41.17 | 1.6856 |
| Jun-02 | 26.34 | 15.18 | 41.52 | 1.6837 |
| Jul-02 | 25.78 | 15.53 | 41.31 | 1.6784 |
| Aug-02 | 26.18 | 15.44 | 41.62 | 1.6653 |
| Sep-02 | 25.23 | 15.24 | 40.47 | 1.6349 |
| Oct-02 | 26.01 | 15.76 | 41.77 | 1.6915 |
| Nov-02 | 23.87 | 15.24 | 39.11 | 1.5977 |
| Dec-02 | 24.31 | 15.24 | 39.55 | 1.6169 |
| Jan-03 | 26.77 | 15.59 | 42.36 | 1.7141 |
| Feb-03 | 17.40 | 15.44 | 32.84 | 1.3458 |
| Mar-03 | 25,96 | 15.75 | 41.71 | 1.6955 |

CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

| | INVOICE | <u>FREIGHT</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|
| | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER |
| <u>MONTH</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>TON</u> | <u>MBTU</u> |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 33.97 | 15.56 | 49.53 | 1.9984 |
| May-02 | 33.50 | 15.61 | 49.11 | 1.9914 |
| Jun-02 | 33.21 | 15.20 | 48.41 | 1.9294 |
| Jul-02 | 34.35 | 15.17 | 49.52 | 1.9871 |
| Aug-02 | 34.00 | 15.58 | 49.58 | 1.9834 |
| Sep-02 | 31.73 | 15.71 | 47.44 | 1.9058 |
| Oct-02 | 35.66 | 15.46 | 51.12 | 2.0534 |
| Nov-02 | 33.11 | 15.74 | 48.85 | 1.9617 |
| Dec-02 | 33.11 | 15.62 | 48.73 | 1.9725 |
| Jan-03 | 31.94 | 16.41 | 48.35 | 1.9453 |
| Feb-03 | 33.25 | 16.23 | 49.48 | 1.9906 |
| Mar-03 | 31.81 | 16.40 | 48.21 | 1.9337 |

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

| | <u>INVOICE</u> | <u>FREIGHT</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER | COST PER |
| <u>MONTH</u> | <u>TON</u> | TON | TON | <u>MBTU</u> |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 30.24 | 12.00 | 42.24 | 1.6563 |
| May-02 | 29.76 | 12.38 | 42.14 | 1.6560 |
| Jun-02 | 29.90 | 12,26 | 42.16 | 1.6526 |
| Jul-02 | 30.28 | 12.38 | 42.66 | 1.6715 |
| Aug-02 | 30.63 | 12.12 | 42.75 | 1.6727 |
| Sep-02 | 31.25 | 11.89 | 43.14 | 1.6933 |
| Oct-02 | 30.74 | 13.04 | 43.78 | 1.7186 |
| Nov-02 | 31.03 | 11.75 | 42.78 | 1.6750 |
| Dec-02 | 31.35 | 11.78 | 43.13 | 1.6922 |
| Jan-03 | 30.21 | 12.32 | 42.53 | 1.6716 |
| Feb-03 | 30.60 | 11.50 | 42.10 | 1.6580 |
| Mar-03 | 30.52 | 11.64 | 42.16 | 1.6419 |
| | | | | |

AUDIT EXHIBIT C

DUKE POWER COMPANY DETAIL OF NUCLEAR COST APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| MONTH | BURN-UP COST | DISPOSAL COST | TOTAL NUCLEAR COST |
|--------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 9,703,050 | 2,899,335 | 12,602,385 |
| May-02 | 11,420,610 | 3,527,700 | 14,948,310 |
| Jun-02 | 11,438,664 | 3,450,524 | 14,889,188 |
| Jul-02 | 12,036,184 | 3,470,748 | 15,506,932 |
| Aug-02 | 11,428,791 | 3,363,829 | 14,792,620 |
| Sep-02 | 9,650,230 | 2,958,229 | 12,608,459 |
| Oct-02 | 10,321,541 | 2,861,997 | 13,183,538 |
| Nov-02 | 9,960,378 | 2,955,644 | 12,916,022 |
| Dec-02 | 11,542,730 | 3,592,523 | 15,135,253 |
| Jan-03 | 11,455,515 | 3,574,613 | 15,030,128 |
| Feb-03 | 10,870,323 | 3,264,046 | 14,134,369 |
| Mar-03 | 11,552,442 | 3,483,902 | 15,036,344 |
| Total | 131,380,458 | 39,403,090 | 170,783,548 |

DUKE POWER COMPANY TOTAL BURNED COST (FOSSIL AND NUCLEAR) APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| TOTAL BURNED COST | ⇔ | 65,338,391 | 66,123,670 | 79,886,249 | 88,938,495 | 84,218,951 | 79,602,388 | 78,052,874 | 67,194,150 | 68,240,192 | 82,335,556 | 73,665,309 | 73,485,395 |
|-------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| PERCENT | % | 19.29% | 22.61% | 18.64% | 17.43% | 17.57% | 15.84% | 16.89% | 19.22% | 22.18% | 18.25% | 19.19% | 20.46% |
| NUCLEAR | \$ | 12,602,385 | 14,948,310 | 14,889,188 | 15,506,932 | 14,792,620 | 12,608,459 | 13,183,538 | 12,916,022 | 15,135,253 | 15,030,128 | 14,134,369 | 15,036,344 |
| PERCENT | % | 0.53% | -0.24% | 0.71% | 0.87% | 0.71% | ~60.0- | 0.01% | 0.00% | %96.0 | 0.79% | 1.26% | 0.23% |
| GAS | () | 344,475 | (158,061) | 564,204 | 770,085 | 600,177 | (70,566) | 9,670 | 1,577 | 653,844 | 648,642 | 928,985 | 171,469 |
| PERCENT | % | 2.07% | %26"0 | 1.09% | 0.62% | 0.27% | 0.41% | 1.16% | 0.58% | 1.22% | 3,45% | 4.05% | 1.02% |
| 峝 | 67 | 1,353,327 | 639,440 | 871,619 | 548,390 | 227,631 | 322,819 | 905,623 | 387,864 | 831,658 | 2,837,459 | 2,985,401 | 748,436 |
| PERCENT | % | 78.11% | 76.66% | 79.56% | 81.08% | 81.45% | 83.84% | 81.94% | 80.20% | 75.64% | 77.51% | 75.50% | 78.29% |
| COAL (1) | 49 | 51,038,204 | 50,693,981 | 63,561,238 | 72,113,088 | 68,598,523 | 66,741,676 | 63,954,043 | 53,888,687 | 51,619,437 | 63,819,327 | 55,616,554 | 57,529,146 |
| MONTH | | Apr-02 | May-02 | Jun-02 | Jul-02 | Aug-02 | Sep-02 | Oct-02 | Nov-02 | Dec-02 | Jan-03 | Feb-03 | Mar-03 |

(1) Includes Emission Allowance Expense

AUDIT EXHIBIT E

DUKE POWER COMPANY COST OF FUEL APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| | TOTAL 0007 0F | PURCHASED AND | FUEL COST RECOVERED | |
|--------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| MONTH | TOTAL COST OF FUEL BURNED | INTERCHANGE POWER FUEL COST | <u>INTERSYSTEM</u> <u>SALES</u> | TOTAL FUEL COST |
| MONTH | ¢ | \$ | \$. | <u> </u> |
| Apr-02 | 65,338,391 | 3,380,048 | (9,639,864) | 59,078,575 |
| May-02 | 66,123,670 | 1,915,627 | (7,699,789) | 60,339,508 |
| Jun-02 | 79,886,249 | 6,554,314 | (9,650,364) | 76,790,199 |
| Jul-02 | 88,938,495 | 7,345,653 | (9,974,156) | 86,309,992 |
| Aug-02 | 84,218,951 | 10,274,882 | (5,677,309) | 88,816,524 |
| Sep-02 | 79,602,388 | 3,629,670 | (14,550,236) | 68,681,822 |
| Oct-02 | 78,052,874 | 3,075,128 | (17,138,120) | 63,989,882 |
| Nov-02 | 67,194,150 | 548,610 | (11,668,616) | 56,074,144 |
| Dec-02 | 68,240,192 | 1,578,841 | (17,250,954) | 52,568,079 |
| Jan-03 | 82,335,556 | 3,610,221 | (19,765,711) | 66,180,066 |
| Feb-03 | 73,665,309 | 2,708,786 | (24,872,554) | 51,501,541 |
| Mar-03 | 73,485,395 | 720,207 | (21,780,045) | 52,425,557 |
| Total | 907,081,620 | 45,341,987 | (169,667,718) | 782,755,889 |

AUDIT EXHIBIT F

DUKE POWER COMPANY FACTOR COMPUTATION APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| | | TOTAL SYSTEM | | BASE COST | |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------|
| | | SALES EXCLUDING | FUEL COST | PER KWH | <u>FUEL</u> |
| | TOTAL FUEL | INTERSYSTEM | PER KWH | INCLUDED IN | ADJUSTMENTS |
| <u>MONTH</u> | COSTS | <u>SALES</u> | <u>SALES</u> | RATES | PER KWH |
| | \$ | KWH | \$/KWH | \$/KWH | \$/KWH |
| Apr-02 | 59,078,575 | 5,670,816,000 | 0.010418 | 0.009500 | 0.000918 |
| May-02 | 60,339,508 | 6,099,610,000 | 0.009892 | 0.009500 | 0.000392 |
| Jun-02 | 76,790,199 | 6,432,593,000 | 0.011938 | 0.009500 | 0.002438 |
| Jul-02 | 86,309,992 | 7,091,147,000 | 0.012172 | 0.009500 | 0.002672 |
| Aug-02 | 88,816,524 | 7,776,761,000 | 0.011421 | 0.009500 | 0.001921 |
| Sep-02 | 68,681,822 | 7,014,782,000 | 0.009791 | 0.009500 | 0.000291 |
| Oct-02 | 63,989,882 | 5,973,700,000 | 0.010712 | 0.009500 | 0.001212 |
| Nov-02 | 56,074,144 | 5,693,145,000 | 0.009849 | 0.009500 | 0.000349 |
| Dec-02 | 52,568,079 | 6,245,858,000 | 0.008416 | 0.009500 | (0.001084) |
| Jan-03 | 66,180,066 | 6,422,578,000 | 0.010304 | 0.009500 | 0.000804 |
| Feb-03 | 51,501,541 | 6,558,869,000 | 0.007852 | 0.009500 | (0.001648) |
| Mar-03 | 52,425,557 | 5,905,214,000 | 0.008878 | 0.009500 | (0.000622) |

Duke Power Company
S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses
April 2002 - May 2003

| | | | ACTUAL | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--|
| Description | Apr-02 | May-02 | Jun-02 | Jul-02 | Aug-02 | Sep-02 |
| Fossil Fuel | 52,736,006 | 51,175,360 | 64,997,061 | 73,431,563 | 69,426,331 | 66,993,929 |
| Nuclear Fuel | 12,602,385 | 14,948,310 | 14,889,188 | 15,506,932 | 14,792,620 | 12,608,459 |
| Purchased Power (1) | 3,380,048 | 1,915,627 | 6,554,314 | 7,345,653 | 10,274,882 | 3,629,670 |
| Subtotal | 68,718,439 | 68,039,297 | 86,440,563 | 96,284,148 | 94,493,833 | 83,232,058 |
| Less: Fuel Cost Recovered through Intersystem Sales | 9,639,864 | 7,699,789 | 9,650,364 | 9,974,156 | 5,677,309 | 14,550,236 |
| Fuel Cost | 59,078,575 | 60,339,508 | 76,790,199 | 86,309,992 | 88,816,524 | 68,681,822 |
| Total System KWH Sales Excluding Intersystem Sales | | | | | | |
| . (\$,000) | 5,670,816 | 6,099,610 | 6,432,593 | 7,091,147 | 7,776,761 | 7,014,782 |
| \$/KWH Sales | 0.010418 | 0.009892 | 0.011938 | 0.012172 | 0.011421 | 0.009791 |
| Less: Base Sales (\$/KWH) | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 |
| Fuel Adjustment Per KWH | 0.000918 | 0.000392 | 0.002438 | 0.002672 | 0.001921 | 0.000291 |
| S.C. KWH Sales (000's) | 1,610,498 | 1,701,386 | 1,841,386 | 1,945,785 | 2,150,826 | 1,958,095 |
| (Over)/Under Recovery | 1,478,437 | 666,943 | 4,489,299 | 5,199,138 | 4,131,737 | 569,806 |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery-March 2002 | (7,446,417) | | | | | |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery this Period | (5,967,980) | (5,301,037) | (811,738) | 4,387,400 | 8,519,136 | 9,088,943 |
| | | | | | | ************************************** |

(Explanation for Note (1) is on Page 3 of 4.)

AUDIT EXHIBIT G PAGE 2 OF 4

> Duke Power Company S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses April 2002 - May 2003

| | | ACTUAI | 1 | | | | ESTIMATED | ED |
|---|-----------------|--|-------------|------------|-------------|--|------------|------------|
| Description | Oct-02 | Nov-02 | Dec-02 | Jan-03 | Feb-03 | Mar-03 | Apr-03 | May-03 |
| Fossil Fuel | 64,869,336 | 54,278,128 | 53,104,939 | 67,305,428 | 59,530,940 | 58,449,051 | 44,012,000 | 61,703,000 |
| Nuclear Fuel | 13,183,538 | 12,916,022 | 15,135,253 | 15,030,128 | 14,134,369 | 15,036,344 | 14,416,000 | 13,062,000 |
| Purchased Power (1) | 3,075,128 | 548,610 | 1,578,841 | 3,610,221 | 2,708,786 | 720,207 | 3,505,000 | 3,505,000 |
| Subtotal | 81,128,002 | 67,742,760 | 69,819,033 | 85,945,777 | 76,374,095 | 74,205,602 | 61,933,000 | 78,270,000 |
| Less: Fuel Cost Recovered through Intersystem Sales | 17,138,120 | 11,668,616 | 17,250,954 | 19,765,711 | 24,872,554 | 21,780,045 | 5,167,000 | 5,167,000 |
| Fuel Cost Total System KWH Sales | 63,989,882 | 56,074,144 | 52,568,079 | 66,180,066 | 51,501,541 | 52,425,557 | 56,766,000 | 73,103,000 |
| (000's) | 5,973,700 | 5,693,145 | 6,245,858 | 6,422,578 | 6,558,869 | 5,905,214 | 5,661,345 | 5,724,661 |
| \$/KWH Sales | 0.010712 | 0.009849 | 0.008416 | 0.010304 | 0.007852 | 0.008878 | 0.010027 | 0.012770 |
| Less: Base Sales (\$/KWH) | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 |
| Fuel Adjustment Per KWH | 0.001212 | 0.000349 | (0.001084) | 0.000804 | (0.001648) | (0.000622) | 0.000527 | 0.003270 |
| S.C. KWH Sales (000's) | 1,692,041 | 1,637,187 | 1,733,465 | 1,772,066 | 1,750,788 | 1,578,394 | 1,652,793 | 1,680,283 |
| (Over)/Under Recovery | (4,172,246) (2) | 571,378 | (1,879,076) | 1,424,741 | (2,885,299) | (981,761) | 871,022 | 5,494,525 |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery - 9/02 (p.1 of 4) | 9,088,943 | and the second s | | | | e e la | | |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery this Period | 4,916,697 | 5,488,075 | 3,608,999 | 5,033,740 | 2,148,441 | 1,166,680 | 2,037,702 | 7,532,227 |

(Explanation for Notes (1) & (2) are on Pages 3 of 4 and 4 of 4.)

AUDIT EXHIBIT G PAGE 3 of 4

Duke Power Company

S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses

APRIL 2002 - MAY 2003

(1) For the review period, April 2002 through March 2003, Staff's Purchase and Interchange Power Costs reflects two types of Staff treatment of certain purchases. These two types concern the treatment of fuel costs components in purchase power transactions. In a continuing effort to identify the fuel portion of Purchased Power for recovery through the Fuel Clause, in its first treatment, Staff has identified the fuel component contained on various Company purchase invoices. Staff's identifiable fuel cost components total \$19,065,134. For cost recovery purposes, the Company's total fuel expenses in its purchases are netted against the fuel associated with its off-system sales. The net effect is that what remains in purchased power fuel is the "native load" portion associated with purchases. Therefore, this \$19,065,134 would be less on a "native load" basis. It should be noted that Duke Power Company has already implemented the use of the identifiable fuel component per the Company's testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E.

In Staff's second treatment, for power marketers where the fuel component of purchases cannot be identified, Staff has utilized the lower of total transaction costs or the "avoided fuel cost" proxy in determining amounts to be recovered. Staff has attempted to identify the fuel portion of avoided costs, once again, to continue in the effort to identify the fuel portion of purchased power costs.

For identifiable fuel costs, Staff notes that since the Company already included the identifiable fuel costs components in the fuel clause computations, Staff did not have to make an adjustment to include them. For non-identifiable fuel costs, Staff adjusted the Company's purchase power figures by \$197,140.

AUDIT EXHIBIT G PAGE 4 of 4

- (2) Staff's October 2002 deferred fuel amount of (\$4,172,246) consists of two amounts:
- (a) The under-recovery deferred fuel entry for the month of October 2002 which totals \$2,050,754; and (b) a Company adjustment to the cumulative balance of the deferred account, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, which totals (\$6,223,000) before a gross receipts tax factor is applied (with the tax factor the amount totals (\$6,250,000)), for a settlement agreement, which reduces the under-recovery of fuel costs, as a result of an independent accounting review by Grant Thornton LLP.

The Company's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of actual March 2003, per its testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E totals \$1,104,000. Staff's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of actual March 2003 totals \$1,166,680. The cumulative under-recovery balance difference, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, between the Staff and the Company as of actual March 2003 is \$62,680. The Company's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of estimated May 2003, per its testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E totals \$7,470,000. Staff's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of estimated May 2003 totals \$7,532,227. The cumulative under-recovery balance difference, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, between the Staff and the Company as of estimated May 2003 is \$62,227.

the appropriate premium or penalty on the coal, and the results are forwarded to the Company's Accounting Section, which in turn, adds a premium or assesses a penalty to the total amount due to the coal vendor.

The Fuel Purchasing Department closely monitors the quality of coal shipped by the various producers. If a certain producer renders poor performance, the purchasing agent records it and considers this when analyzing any future offers from the supplier.

As mentioned previously, Staff examined spot coal offers received for the months of December 2002 and January 2003. Staff obtained the Company's Evaluation of Spot Bids computer runs for the aforementioned months. The Evaluation of Spot Bids run is listed alphabetically by plant, with each plant's spot coal offers ranked by cost per MBTU. Also included on the Evaluation of Spot Bids run is the name of the coal company, the name of the producer, number of tons offered, coal specifications, the number of tons purchased, the plant to which the coal was shipped, or a reason for rejecting the offer.

During December 2002, 20 offers were submitted (per offer sheets) and Duke accepted 21 orders (several plant orders per offer sheet). During January 2003, 29 offers were submitted (per offer sheets) and Duke accepted 10 orders.

RECOMPUTATION OF TRUE-UP FOR (OVER) UNDER-RECOVERED FUEL COSTS

Staff analyzed the revised cumulative under-recovery of fuel costs that the Company had incurred for the period April 1, 2002 through March 31, 2003 totaling \$1,121,094. Staff added projected under-recovery of \$871,022 for the month of April 2003 and the projected under-recovery of \$5,494,525 for May 2003 to arrive at a revised cumulative under-recovery of

\$7,486,641. The Company's cumulative under-recovery as of March 2003 and cumulative under-recovery as of May 2003 differs from Staff's. Staff's Purchased Power figures for most of the review period differ from the Company's figures. The Company's and the Staff's Purchased Power figures are the same for December 2002, when compared on a rounded basis. Staff's figures, per Staff's report, reflect calculation adjustments made to Purchased Power Costs for the aforementioned months, based on Staff's review of Purchased Power system operations reports and invoices. Staff's revised Exhibit G, S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues and Expenses, which consist of four pages, provide details of Staff's revised cumulative under-recovery balance.

As stated in Duke Power Company's Adjustment for Fuel Costs, fuel costs will be included in base rates to the extent determined reasonable and proper by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission should consider the revised under-recovery of \$7,486,641 along with the anticipated fuel costs for the period June 1, 2003 to May 31, 2004, for the purpose of determining the base cost of fuel in rates effective June 1, 2003.

This revised under-recovery figure of \$7,486,641 was provided to the Commission's Utilities Department.

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION

Based on the Audit Staff's examination of Duke Power Company's books and records, and the utilization of the fuel cost-recovery mechanism as directed by this Commission, the Audit Staff is of the opinion that the Company has complied with the directives (per the Fuel Adjustment Clause) of the Commission.

AUDIT EXHIBIT E (Revised)

DUKE POWER COMPANY COST OF FUEL APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| | TOTAL COST OF | PURCHASED AND INTERCHANGE | FUEL COST RECOVERED INTERSYSTEM | |
|--------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| MONTH | FUEL BURNED | POWER FUEL COST | SALES | TOTAL FUEL COST |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Apr-02 | 65,338,391 | 3,380,048 | (9,639,864) | 59,078,575 |
| May-02 | 66,123,670 | 1,915,627 | (7,699,789) | 60,339,508 |
| Jun-02 | 79,886,249 | 6,553,067 | (9,650,364) | 76,788,952 |
| Jul-02 | 88,938,495 | 7,345,653 | (9,974,156) | 86,309,992 |
| Aug-02 | 84,218,951 | 10,178,401 | (5,677,309) | 88,720,043 |
| Sep-02 | 79,602,388 | 3,629,670 | (14,550,236) | 68,681,822 |
| Oct-02 | 78,052,874 | 3,075,128 | (17,138,120) | 63,989,882 |
| Nov-02 | 67,194,150 | 544,960 | (11,668,616) | 56,070,494 |
| Dec-02 | 68,240,192 | 1,578,841 | (17,250,954) | 52,568,079 |
| Jan-03 | 82,335,556 | 3,610,221 | (19,765,711) | 66,180,066 |
| Feb-03 | 73,665,309 | 2,706,286 | (24,872,554) | 51,499,041 |
| Mar-03 | 73,485,395 | 664,272 | (21,780,045) | 52,369,622 |
| Total | 907,081,620 | 45,182,174 | (169,667,718) | 782,596,076 |

AUDIT EXHIBIT F (Revised)

DUKE POWER COMPANY FACTOR COMPUTATION APRIL 2002 - MARCH 2003

| | | TOTAL SYSTEM | | BASE COST | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | SALES EXCLUDING | FUEL COST | PER KWH | <u>FUEL</u> |
| | TOTAL FUEL | <u>INTERSYSTEM</u> | PER KWH | INCLUDED IN | ADJUSTMENTS |
| <u>MONTH</u> | <u>COSTS</u> | <u>SALES</u> | SALES | RATES | PER KWH |
| | \$ | KWH | \$/KWH | \$/KWH | \$/KWH |
| Apr-02 | 59,078,575 | 5,670,816,000 | 0.010418 | 0.009500 | 0.000918 |
| May-02 | 60,339,508 | 6,099,610,000 | 0.009892 | 0.009500 | 0.000392 |
| Jun-02 | 76,788,952 | 6,432,593,000 | 0.011937 | 0.009500 | 0.002437 |
| Jul-02 | 86,309,992 | 7,091,147,000 | 0.012172 | 0.009500 | 0.002672 |
| Aug-02 | 88,720,043 | 7,776,761,000 | 0.011408 | 0.009500 | 0.001908 |
| Sep-02 | 68,681,822 | 7,014,782,000 | 0.009791 | 0.009500 | 0.000291 |
| Oct-02 | 63,989,882 | 5,973,700,000 | 0.010712 | 0.009500 | 0.001212 |
| Nov-02 | 56,070,494 | 5,693,145,000 | 0.009849 | 0.009500 | 0.000349 |
| Dec-02 | 52,568,079 | 6,245,858,000 | 0.008416 | 0.009500 | (0.001084) |
| Jan-03 | 66,180,066 | 6,422,578,000 | 0.010304 | 0.009500 | 0.000804 |
| Feb-03 | 51,499,041 | 6,558,869,000 | 0.007852 | 0.009500 | (0.001648) |
| Mar-03 | 52,369,622 | 5,905,214,000 | 0.008868 | 0.009500 | (0.000632) |

S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses **Duke Power Company** April 2002 - May 2003

| | | | ACTUAL | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Description | Apr-02 | May-02 | Jun-02 | Jul-02 | Aug-02 | Sep-02 |
| Fossil Fuel | 52,736,006 | 51,175,360 | 64,997,061 | 73,431,563 | 69,426,331 | 66.993.929 |
| Nuclear Fuel | 12,602,385 | 14,948,310 | 14,889,188 | 15,506,932 | 14,792,620 | 12.608.459 |
| Purchased Power (1) | 3,380,048 | 1,915,627 | 6,553,067 | 7,345,653 | 10,178,401 | 3,629,670 |
| Subtotal | 68,718,439 | 68,039,297 | 86,439,316 | 96,284,148 | 94,397,352 | 83,232,058 |
| Less: Fuel Cost Recovered through Intersystem Sales | 9,639,864 | 7,699,789 | 9,650,364 | 9,974,156 | 5.677.309 | 14.550.236 |
| Fuel Cost | 59,078,575 | 60,339,508 | 76,788,952 | 86,309,992 | 88.720.043 | 68 681 822 |
| Total System KWH Sales Excluding Intersystem Sales | | | | | • | |
| (s,000) | 5,670,816 | 6,099,610 | 6,432,593 | 7,091,147 | 7,776,761 | 7,014,782 |
| | 0.010418 | 0.009892 | 0.011937 | 0.012172 | 0.011408 | 0.009791 |
| Less: Base Sales (\$/KWH) | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 |
| Fuel Adjustment Per KWH | 0.000918 | 0.000392 | 0.002437 | 0.002672 | 0.001908 | 0.000291 |
| S.C. KWH Sales (000's) | 1,610,498 | 1,701,386 | 1,841,386 | 1,945,785 | 2,150,826 | 1.958,095 |
| (Over)/Under Recovery | 1,478,437 | 666,943 | 4,487,458 | 5,199,138 | 4,103,776 | 569,806 |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery-March 2002 | (7,446,417) | | | | | |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery this Period | (5.967.980) | (5 301 037) | (843 £70) | A 20E EEO | 00000 | |
| | (post resta) | (100,100,0) | (6/0,019) | 4,385,559 | 8,489,335 | 9,059,141 |

(Explanation for Note (1) is on Page 3 of 4.)

AUDIT EXHIBIT G PAGE 2 OF 4 (Revised)

Duke Power Company
S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses
April 2002 - May 2003

| i de de la constante de la con | | ACTUAL | | | : | | ESTIMATED | JED |
|--|-----------------|--|-------------|--|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Description | Oct-02 | Nov-02 | Dec-02 | Jan-03 | Feb-03 | Mar-03 | Apr-03 | May-03 |
| Fossil Fuel | 64,869,336 | 54,278,128 | 53,104,939 | 67,305,428 | 59,530,940 | 58,449,051 | 44,012,000 | 61,703,000 |
| Nuclear Fuel | 13,183,538 | 12,916,022 | 15,135,253 | 15,030,128 | 14,134,369 | 15,036,344 | 14,416,000 | 13,062,000 |
| Purchased Power (1) | 3,075,128 | 544,960 | 1,578,841 | 3,610,221 | 2,706,286 | 664,272 | 3,505,000 | 3,505,000 |
| Subtotal | 81,128,002 | 67,739,110 | 69,819,033 | 85,945,777 | 76,371,595 | 74,149,667 | 61,933,000 | 78,270,000 |
| Less: Fuel Cost Recovered through Intersystem Sales | 17,138,120 | 11,668,616 | 17,250,954 | 19,765,711 | 24,872,554 | 21,780,045 | 5,167,000 | 5,167,000 |
| Fuel Cost Total System KWH Sales | 63,989,882 | 56,070,494 | 52,568,079 | 66,180,066 | 51,499,041 | 52,369,622 | 56,766,000 | 73,103,000 |
| Excluding Intersystem Sales (000's) | 5,973,700 | 5,693,145 | 6,245,858 | 6,422,578 | 6,558,869 | 5,905,214 | 5,661,345 | 5,724,661 |
| \$/KWH Sales | 0.010712 | 0.009849 | 0.008416 | 0.010304 | 0.007852 | 0.008868 | 0.010027 | 0.012770 |
| Less: Base Sales (\$/KWH) | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 | 0.009500 |
| Fuel Adjustment Per KWH | 0.001212 | 0.000349 | (0.001084) | 0.000804 | (0.001648) | (0.000632) | 0.000527 | 0.003270 |
| S.C. KWH Sales (000's) | 1,692,041 | 1,637,187 | 1,733,465 | 1,772,066 | 1,750,788 | 1,578,394 | 1,652,793 | 1,680,283 |
| (Over)/Under Recovery | (4,172,246) (2) | 571,378 | (1,879,076) | 1,424,741 | (2,885,299) | (997,545) | 871,022 | 5,494,525 |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery - 9/02 (p.1 of 4) | 9,059,141 | THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O | | A STATE OF THE STA | | | | |
| Cumulative (Over)/Under Recovery this Period | 4,886,895 | 5,458,273 | 3,579,197 | 5,003,938 | 2,118,639 | 1,121,094 | 1,992,116 | 7,486,641 |

(Explanation for Notes (1) & (2) are on Pages 3 of 4 and 4 of 4.)

AUDIT EXHIBIT G PAGE 3 of 4 (Revised)

Duke Power Company

S.C. Retail Comparison of Fuel Revenues & Expenses

APRIL 2002 - MAY 2003

(1) For the review period, April 2002 through March 2003, Staff's Purchase and Interchange Power Costs reflects two types of Staff treatment of certain purchases. These two types concern the treatment of fuel costs components in purchase power transactions. In a continuing effort to identify the fuel portion of Purchased Power for recovery through the Fuel Clause, in its first treatment, Staff has identified the fuel component contained on various Company purchase invoices. Staff's identifiable fuel cost components total \$20,008,131. For cost recovery purposes, the Company's total fuel expenses in its purchases are netted against the fuel associated with its off-system sales. The net effect is that what remains in purchased power fuel is the "native load" portion associated with purchases. Therefore, this \$20,008,131 would be less on a "native load" basis. The identifiable fuel cost components, on a "native load" basis totals \$8,819,365. Staff has allocated amounts for the identifiable fuel costs components by the ratio of native load MWH purchases to total MWH purchases. It should be noted that Duke Power Company has already implemented the use of the identifiable fuel component per the Company's testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E.

In Staff's second treatment, for power marketers where the fuel component of purchases cannot be identified, Staff has utilized the lower of total transaction costs or the "avoided fuel cost" proxy in determining amounts to be recovered. Staff has attempted to identify the fuel portion of avoided costs, once again, to continue in the effort to identify the fuel portion of purchased power costs.

It should be noted that Staff has revised its purchase power costs for several invoices that were originally considered to be non-identifiable for fuel cost component purposes. The invoices had purchases and sales information on them. After a closer examination, Staff found that the Company had listed purchase fuel components on the invoices where usually the sales fuel components were listed. Staff traced these purchase amounts to the Company's purchase reports. Therefore, Staff had to treat these invoices as identifiable fuel cost component invoices. The fuel costs of \$505,368 are included in Staff's revised identifiable fuel cost components total. On a native load basis, the amount totals \$59,432. For identifiable fuel costs, except for those fuel costs previously noted on a native load basis, Staff notes that since the Company already

included the identifiable fuel costs components in the fuel clause computations, Staff did not have to make an adjustment to include them. For non-identifiable fuel costs, Staff adjusted the Company's purchase power figures by \$59,700.

- (2) Staff's October 2002 deferred fuel amount of (\$4,172,246) consists of two amounts:
 - (a) The under-recovery deferred fuel entry for the month of October 2002 which totals \$2,050,754; and (b) a Company adjustment to the cumulative balance of the deferred account, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, which totals (\$6,223,000) before a gross receipts tax factor is applied (with the tax factor the amount totals (\$6,250,000)), for a settlement agreement, which reduces the under-recovery of fuel costs, as a result of an independent accounting review by Grant Thornton LLP.

The Company's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of actual March 2003, per its testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E totals \$1,104,000. Staff's revised cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of actual March 2003 totals \$1,121,094. The revised cumulative under-recovery balance difference, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, between the Staff and the Company as of actual March 2003 is \$17,094. The Company's cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of estimated May 2003, per its testimony in Docket No. 2003-3-E totals \$7,470,000. Staff's revised cumulative under-recovery balance, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, as of estimated May 2003 totals \$7,486,641. The revised cumulative under-recovery balance difference, on a S.C. jurisdictional basis, between the Staff and the Company as of estimated May 2003 is \$16,641.